

## Remarks

In the subject Office Action, claims 1-4 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and claims 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 17-20 were allowed. Claims 5-6 and 24-30 were objected to, but are allowable if rewritten to not depend from rejected base claims. In response, Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 17-20, and finding claims 5-6 and 24-30 allowable. Applicant respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-4 and 21-23. Applicant has taken this opportunity to amend claims 1, 15 and 20 to correct a number of previously undetected informalities. The amendments are not entered to overcome the prior art, and no new matter has been introduced.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,911,840 to Milne et al. ("*Milne*"). Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examined alleged that that each and every feature of claim 1 was disclosed in *Milne*.

However, *Milne* merely teaches "... dedicated (proxy) circuit 208 operate in response to a clock signal ...", column 3, lines 58-59. , *Milne* **does not** teach "... the proxy circuit to output a periodic signal ... (for) ... a voltage regulator", which in turn "conditionally regulates the voltage it provides to the integrated circuit, based at least in part on the periodic signal", with the periodic signal having a frequency reflective of the potential of the operating frequency of an operational circuit, as recited in claim 1.

*Milne* teaches the second clock (M\_CLK) to be specific integer multiplier or a fraction of the first frequency, "... M\_CLK, provided by clock multiplier 210 ...", column 2, lines 59-60; "... where M in one embodiment is an integer. In an alternative

embodiment, M is any number, including a fractional number...", column 2, lines 62-64. But, *Milne*, **does not** teach the second frequency being " ... reflective of a potential of the first frequency ...", as recited in claim 1.

*Milne* **does not** teach the interface circuit 203 as a voltage regulator controller. *Milne*, in fact, teaches away from at least one of these features since it specifically teaches the interface circuit 203 to "effectuate data transfer" (column 4, line 4) and to "isolates" (column 4, line 15).

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over *Milne*.

Claims 2-4 depend from and add additional features to independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over *Milne*, claims 2-4 are likewise patentable over *Milne*.

Claim 21 was also subjected to *Milne* disclosure.

However, *Milne* **does not** teach of "a first microprocessor having ... ", as recited in claim 21.

*Milne* teaches " ... dedicated (proxy) circuit 208 operate in response to a clock signal ... ", column 3, lines 58-59. Furthermore, *Milne* **does not** teach " ... a first proxy circuit to output a periodic signal ... (for) ... a voltage regulator", which in turn "conditionally regulates the voltage it provides to the microprocessor, based at least in part on the periodic signal", with the periodic signal having a frequency reflective of the potential of the operating frequency of an operational circuit,, as recited in claim 21.

*Milne* teaches the second clock (M\_CLK) to be specific integer multiplier or a fraction of the first frequency, " .. M\_CLK, provided by clock multiplier 210 ...", column 2, lines 59-60; "... where M in one embodiment is an integer. In an alternative embodiment, M is any number, including a fractional number...", column 2, lines 62-64. But, *Milne*, **does not** teach the second frequency being " ... reflective of a potential of the first frequency ...", as recited in claim 21.

*Milne* **does not** teach the interface circuit 203 as a voltage regulator controller. *Milne*, in fact, teaches away from at least one of these features since it specifically teaches the interface circuit 203 to “effectuate data transfer” (column 4, line 4) and to “isolates” (column 4, line 15).

*Milne* **does not** teach of “a bus coupled to the first microprocessor”, as recited in claim 21.

*Milne* **does not** teach of “a networking interface coupled to the bus”, as recited in claim 21.

*Milne* teaches the proxy circuit “I/O routing ring 106A” (column 2, line 12). *Milne* **does not** teach the proxy circuit “comprises a ring oscillator”, as recited in claim 23.

For at least these reasons, claim 21 is patentable over *Milne*.

Claims 22 and 23 depend from and add additional features to independent claim 21. Therefore, for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is patentable over *Milne*, claims 22 and 23 are likewise patentable over *Milne*.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over “*Milne*”, as applied to claim 21, and in further view of *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ8 (“*Regis*”). Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 31 depends from and add additional features to independent claim 21. The deficiencies of *Milne* with respect of claim 21, as described above, are not overcome by the teachings of *Regis*. Therefore, for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is patentable over *Milne*, claims 31 is likewise patentable over *Milne* in view of *Regis*.

Claims 32 depends from and add additional features to dependent claim 31, which further depends on claim 21. The deficiencies of *Milne* with respect of claim 21,

as described above, are not overcome by the teachings of *Regis*. Therefore, for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is patentable over *Milne*, claims 32 is likewise patentable over *Milne* in view of *Regis*.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 5-16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base. Claims 5-16 depend from and add additional features to independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over *Milne*, claims 5-16 are likewise patentable over *Milne*. Therefore, re-writing of claims 5-16 is not necessary.

Claims 24-30 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base. Claims 24-30 depend from and add additional features to independent claim 21. Therefore, for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is patentable over *Milne*, claims 24-30 are likewise patentable over *Milne*. Therefore, rewriting of claims 24-30 is not necessary.

### **Conclusion**


In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that all claims, 1-32 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 503-796-2437.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: March 6, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Aloysius T.C. AuYeung  
Reg. No. 35,432

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: 503-222-9981